BIG CREEK HYDROELECTRIC SYSTEM, POWERHOUSE 3 HAER CA-167-H
(Big Creek No. 3) *HAER CA-167-H*
San Joaquin River, near confluence of Italian Bar Road and Million Dollar Road
Big Creek vicinity
Fresno County
California

PHOTOGRAPHS

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

FIELD RECORDS

HISTORIC AMERICAN ENGINEERING RECORD
National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240-0001

HISTORIC AMERICAN ENGINEERING RECORD

BIG CREEK HYDROELECTRIC SYSTEM, POWERHOUSE 3
(Big Creek No. 3)

HAER No. CA-167-H

LOCATION:	San Joaquin River, near confluence of Italian Bar Road and Million Dollar Road Big Creek vicinity, Fresno County, California
STRUCTURAL TYPE:	Reinforced concrete and steel power generation building
DATE OF CONSTRUCTION:	1923
DESIGNER:	Southern California Edison Construction Department
BUILDER:	Southern California Edison Construction Department
PRESENT OWNER:	Southern California Edison, Northern Hydro Division
PRESENT USE:	Hydroelectric generation facility
SIGNIFICANCE:	Constructed in 1923, Big Creek Powerhouse 3 was the last powerhouse built during the great expansion of the Big Creek system by Southern California Edison between 1920 and 1929. At the time of its construction, Big Creek 3 was the largest hydroelectric generating plant in the western United States. Dubbed "The Electrical Wonder of the West" by the electrical press, the plant was expanded to a total of five generating units by 1980. It was the second hydroelectric plant in the world to use 220kV in commercial transmission. The outdoor switching yard at Big Creek No. 3 marks the transition from the early phase of powerhouse design, in which transformers and switching took place within the generating buildings, to the later use of outdoor transformers and switchyards. The Big Creek system was the premiere Western example of the transition from the construction of isolated power plants serving local markets to the construction of large integrated systems connected to distant energy markets via high-voltage transmission. The system is also significant in the history of the Los Angeles region. Conceived as a means of powering both residential development and electric railways, power from Southern California Edison's Big Creek plants was instrumental in the rise of suburban development in the region.

The system is closely associated with railroad, energy, and development magnate Henry Huntington; with Edison executives and power pioneers A.C. Balch, William Kerckhoff, and George C. Ward; visionary California hydroelectric engineer John Eastwood; and longtime Big Creek manager David Redinger.

HISTORIAN: Daniel Shoup, PhD
Archaeological/Historical Consultants, Oakland, California

PROJECT INFORMATION: The research for this report was sponsored by Southern California Edison Corporation as part of the HAER documentation of Big Creek Powerhouses 1, 2/2A, 3, and 8 and Operator's Cottage 115. Historical narratives were written by Daniel Shoup of Archaeological/Historical Consultants (Oakland, California) with contributions from Geoff Goodman. Historical research was conducted between September and December 2009 by Laurence Shoup, Suzanne Baker, Geoff Goodman, and Daniel Shoup of Archaeological/Historical Consultants. HAER photography was produced by David De Vries and Marissa Rocke of Mesa Technical (Berkeley, California) between September 2009 and January 2010. Administrative and research support was provided by Don Dukleth of Southern California Edison, Northern Hydro Division (Big Creek, California), and Thomas T. Taylor of Southern California Edison, Corporate Environment, Health, and Safety (Rosemead, California). NERC CIP compliance review was conducted by Ahmad Sanati and Sooraj Sadanandan of Southern California Edison, Power Production Department (Rosemead, California).

This report is presented as one of a series of HAER reports on the early Big Creek powerhouses, including Powerhouses 1, 2/2A, 3, and 8, and Operator's Cottage 115. These studies focus on the period from 1912, when construction began, to 1929, the end of the "great expansion" of the Big Creek system. Previous research has identified 1912-1929 as the period of significance for the system as a whole.

This study focuses on the history of the powerhouse structure itself. Other features of the Big Creek system, such as dams, tunnels, penstocks, residences, forebays, outdoor substations, and power lines are not treated in detail. Similarly, the social history of Big Creek town and other communities in the vicinity are touched on only briefly in this text. Many publications and technical reports offer more detail on the Big Creek system. Former Big Creek superintendent David Redinger's *The Story of*

Big Creek remains a key reference work.[1] Other important works include historic studies and significance evaluations of the system and the town, one of which is appended as Field Notes to CA-167-E.[2] Previous HAER reports on parts of the Big Creek system were also prepared by Thomas T. Taylor of Southern California Edison.

HAER reports for the Big Creek System prepared to date include:

- Operator Cottage, Big Creek # 8 (HAER CA-167-A)
- Big Creek #3 penstock standpipes (HAER CA-167-B)
- Operator Cottage 105, Big Creek Town (HAER CA-167-C)
- Operator House Garage, Big Creek Town (HAER CA-167-D)
- Big Creek Powerhouse 1 (HAER CA-167-E)
- Big Creek Powerhouse 2/2A (HAER CA-167-F)
- Big Creek Powerhouse 8 (HAER CA-167-G)
- Big Creek Powerhouse 3 (HAER CA-167-H)
- Operator Cottage 115, Big Creek Town (HAER CA-167-I)

See the bibliography for this report and the other reports in the series for more complete references. See the Field Notes attached to this report for historic photographs of this powerhouse.

---

[1] David H. Redinger, *The Story of Big Creek* (Los Angeles: Angelus Press, 1949).
[2] Laurence H. Shoup, *"The Hardest Working Water in the World": A History and Significance Evaluation of the Big Creek Hydroelectric System*, report prepared for Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA, 1987; Laurence H. Shoup, *Life at Big Creek Town 1929-1947: Historic Context Statement and National Register of Historic Places Significance Evaluation*, Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA, 1997.

STYLE AND CONSTRUCTION

Setting and Style

Big Creek Powerhouse 3 is located on the San Joaquin River, approximately 5.5 miles downstream from its confluence with Big Creek, in Fresno County, California, in an otherwise undeveloped landscape of mountains, oak, and pine. Constructed in 1923, the powerhouse consists of a reinforced concrete and structural steel generating and control building, and a reinforced concrete transformer platform which projects over the tailraces (Views CA-167-H-3, CA-167-H-4).

The powerhouse rises from the San Joaquin River on a foundation of reinforced concrete. The building consists of a main generating room that was 205'-0" long, 56'-6½" wide and 66'-11" high when built in 1923. Attached to the rear of the generating building is a smaller, two-story building 165'-5" long, 24' wide and 38'-5" high which holds the control, maintenance, and switching rooms.

Powerhouse 3 is built in the industrial modern style. The north (tailrace) and south (penstock) façades of the generating room are dominated by six massive piers projecting slightly from the wall line, each of which corresponds to one of the six generating units inside the plant. Between the piers are narrow recessed bays. Both piers and bays are dominated by vertical window openings interrupted by horizontal panels. A rolling door interrupts the eastern end of the north (tailrace) façade (see Views CA-167-H-43 and CA- 167-H-44).

The east and west façades have a single central pier with a peaked top. On the west end, the upper window opening continues into a large access door below. The whole generating structure sits atop an angular scotia molding that separates the main structure from the foundation (see Views CA-167-H-45 and CA-167-H-52).

The roof of the generating room has a low parapet wall. The rounded edges of the piers rise above the roof level to create a crenellated effect on the north and south facades, while the east and west roofline is slightly peaked above the central pier. The corners of the building are rounded and recessed slightly on both sides.

The control structure on the north (tailrace) side of the building is two stories high and has window openings on both floors at 10-foot intervals, except for the center and ends of the second floor, where the low tension bus exits the second-floor switch rooms on the way to the transformers. The roof of the control structure has a parapet wall with six stepped rectangular crenellations forming a roof comb.

The north (tailrace) side of the building continues into a platform supported by undecorated arches that holds the 220kV transformers and low-tension switches.

Like Powerhouses 1, 2, and 8, Big Creek 3 was designed for later expansion. It was constructed to accommodate only four generating units, which made the original appearance of the plant asymmetrical. The original east end was of metal lath and plaster in order to make expansion easier. The plant was completed to its final planned dimensions between 1978 and 1980.

Powerhouse 3 reflects the increasing turn toward modernism evident in 1920s industrial architecture. In general, early twentieth century industrial architects derived architectural forms from the frame of the structure, leading to a 'façade grid' determined by the alternation of vertical structural supports and horizontal floors.[3] Powerhouse 3 reflects a different decorative approach to architectural decoration than Powerhouses 1, 2, or 8, each of which used neoclassical elements. Powerhouse 3, by contrast, avoids Classical influences, except for perhaps the molding at the base of the plant. Though the architectural decoration is not explicitly derived from one prevalent style, electric structures built in Los Angeles during the 1920s often evoked a combination of art deco and Mesoamerican influences. Southern California Edison's engineers, based in the Los Angeles area, were presumably familiar with these developments.

Powerhouse 3, with its outdoor switching apparatus and adjacent 'switch garden' that served the entire Big Creek system, reflects the increasing trend in power-plant construction toward establishing open-air switchyards. Powerhouse 3 demonstrates how this trend could affect the aesthetic success of powerhouse structures: the adjacent platform with its arched substructure and large transformers obscures the view of the building's façade and clashes with its angular shapes and regular rhythm (CA-167-H-4).

Although Powerhouse 3 is a well-preserved example of important trends in American industrial and public utility architecture, it cannot be said to be a uniquely significant example of its architectural style or building type. Rather, the significance of Powerhouse 3 lies in its excellent state of preservation and in its role as part of a pioneering large integrated system of electrical generating plants. As Duncan Hay notes of contemporary hydroelectric systems more generally,

> individual structures and pieces of hardware were seldom significant in and of themselves. Their importance lay in their role within complete power-plants and, in some cases, within basin-wide or regional developments.[4]

As noted above, the Big Creek system remains one of the most significant generation and transmission systems in California and North America.

Architecture, Design, and Engineering
Powerhouse 3 was designed by the Construction Department of Southern California Edison. The architects and designers of the powerhouse are unknown.

A main source of data about Powerhouse 3 is found in the Valuations and Unit Cost Developments prepared by Arthur Kelley in 1924. Kelley was a consulting valuation engineer who prepared detailed inventories of the Big Creek plants and their contents between 1922 and 1932. Kelley or his representatives were on site during the construction of Powerhouse 3 to perform cost and labor studies and to record the volumes and nature of materials used. The

[3] Betsy Hunter Bradley, *The Works: The Industrial Architecture of the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 231.
[4] Duncan Hay, *Hydroelectric Development in the United States, 1880-1940* (Washington, D.C.: Edison Electric Institute, 1991), 28.

resulting works – *Valuation, Unit Cost Development,* and *Price Book* – for the plant provide a wealth of information and are major primary sources for this report.[5]

Suppliers and Contractors

During initial construction in 1923, concrete mixing plants were built near the powerhouse site and used spoils from tunnel excavations as base material. Most of the hydraulic equipment in the plant, including the main turbines, inlet pipes, draft tubes, governor oil pressure tanks, and relief valves, was purchased from the Wellman-Seaver-Morgan Company of Cleveland, Ohio.[6] The house generator wheels, however, were manufactured by the Pelton Water Wheel Company of San Francisco, California.[7] The electrical equipment, including the main generators, house generators, exciters, and switchboards was purchased from Westinghouse.[8]

Construction Narrative

The original Big Creek plans, filed by John S. Eastwood in 1909, called for Powerhouse 3 to utilize impulse turbines at a head of slightly over 1400'. However, by 1920 improvements in the efficiency of vertical turbines had made it possible to obtain a similar amount of energy from heads as low as 700', and Southern California Edison decided in February 1920 to split the head originally designated for Powerhouse 3 into two plants. Powerhouse 8 was constructed first. Immediately after its completion in August 1921, however, work began on the infrastructure of Powerhouse 3. Although Unit 1 was originally scheduled for completion in spring 1921, tunnel and road building consumed late 1921 and much of 1922.[9] Excavation for the plant's foundation was not completed until November 15, 1922, and pouring concrete took place between November 20, 1922 and February 8, 1923. Construction of the building itself began on April 12, and construction of the plant was well underway by May 1.[10]

Powerhouse 3 was designed to ultimately hold six units, but the initial structure was built to contain four. Unit 2 was placed on Southern California Edison's lines on Sept 30, Unit 1 on Oct 3, and Unit 3 on Oct 7, 1923. Unit 4 was added in 1948 and Unit 5 in 1980. The plant today contains only five generating units.

---

[5] See Arthur R. Kelley, *Valuation of Electric Properties, Southern California Edison Big Creek No. 3 Development, December 31, 1924*, Federal Project 67 Appendices, Plant Accounting Department, Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA; Arthur R. Kelley, *Unit Cost Development and Price Book Accompanying Valuation of Electric Properties, Southern California Edison Big Creek No. 3 Development, December 31, 1924*, Federal Project 67 Appendices, Plant Accounting Department, Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA; Arthur R. Kelley, *Price Book Accompanying Valuation of Electric Properties, Southern California Edison Big Creek No. 3 Development, December 31, 1924*, Federal Project 67 Appendices, Plant Accounting Department, Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA.

[6] Kelley, *Valuation*, 108-109, 112.

[7] Kelley *Valuation*, 110.

[8] Kelley, *Valuation*, 120-126.

[9] "Southern California Edison Company to Start 150,000-Kw. Station," *Electrical World*, September 24, 1921, 89-92.

[10] "Fourth Plant on Big Creek Started," *Electrical World*, April 28, 1923, 996-997; "Work Progressing Rapidly on Big Creek No. Three," *Journal of Electricity and Western Industry*, May 1, 1923, 341.

The total cost per horsepower of the development was about $150, considerably more than in normal construction projects. In his description of the engineering feats accomplished in the construction of the Big Creek system, Kelley explains some of the reason for the increased costs:

> To visualize the difficulties attendant upon construction in this country is almost impossible, for the average reader cannot imagine working areas where practically no storage space is available, where a workman handling tools or carrying a piece of material must climb or descend a hillside of 45° inclination with almost every step; where no roads are available; where river floods, extreme summer heat and winter cold all occur with distressing regularity, where the transfer of articles between points a mile distant in an air line often involves 10 or 20 miles of travel and a climb or descent of several thousand feet; where labor is hard to get and harder still to keep, and where the weight and bulk of construction machinery, cement and power house machinery offer almost insurmountable difficulties….Such conditions must be distinctly borne in mind when perusing the contents of this valuation, for the costs contained herein bear very little relationship to corresponding costs incurred under conditions where all facilities are afforded and where comparatively few difficulties are met.[11]

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

California and Electrical Development of the West

California holds an important place in the history of hydroelectric power generation. Despite relatively low rainfall, especially in the southern regions, the high heads available in the state's mountainous terrain made waterpower important in California's industrial development. The mining industry pioneered the development of dam, flume, and penstock technologies at an early date, while Lester Pelton's development of the Pelton wheel in the 1880s dramatically increased the efficiency of the waterwheel in high head settings.[12] In California, however, this energy was typically located in remote areas far distant from urban centers, restricting its use to industries located nearby.

The development of Thomas Edison's integrated system of dynamos, lamps, and circuitry after 1880 led to a boom in urban electrification. However, widespread dependence on direct current, which had a high rate of transmission loss, made the usefulness of electricity dependent on proximity to a central station. The introduction of alternating current transmission and voltage transformers by George Westinghouse after 1886, however, opened up the possibility of transmitting electricity over long distances.[13] Much of the world's pioneering work in AC transmission took place in California, with early world records for distance and voltage set by transmission lines in Bodie (Standard Consolidated Mining Company, 1891), San Antonio to Pomona (San Antonio Light and Power, 1892), and Folsom to Sacramento (Horatio Livermore, 1893).[14]

---

[11] Kelley, *Valuation*, 2.
[12] Hay, *Hydroelectric Development*, 6.
[13] Hay, *Hydroelectric Development*, 9.
[14] Hay, *Hydroelectric Development*, 19, 28.

Once the potential for connecting hydraulic and electrical power was demonstrated by Westinghouse's development at Niagara Falls (1895), hydroelectric development began in earnest, and nowhere more intensely than in California. Record-setting developments included the first 33 kilovolt (kV) transmission by Southern California Edison's Santa Ana No. 1 plant (1898); use of a 1,300' head in the Mount Whitney Power Company's plant (1899); and, superlatively, the 140-mile, 60kV Colgate transmission line built by Bay Counties Power Company in 1901.[15] "California," claimed the journal *Electrical West* in 1912, "is the birthplace of real long-distance power transmission on this continent."[16]

Southern California Edison's Big Creek project, begun in 1911, was the apex of early twentieth century hydroelectric development in California and was among the world's largest hydroelectric systems at the time of its construction. The system set successive world records for highest voltage ever used in commercial transmission: 150kV (1913) and 220 kV (1923). Powerhouse 1 and Powerhouse 2A had among the highest heads used in North America – 2,131' and 2,418' respectively. In 1929, at the end of the great expansion of the Big Creek system, the five Big Creek powerhouses (1, 2, 2A, 3, and 8) each held a place among the top ten California hydroelectric plants for kilowatts and horsepower generated.[17]

Origins of the Big Creek System

The Big Creek system was the brainchild of visionary engineer John Eastwood (1857-1924), who first identified the Big Creek and San Joaquin River systems as an ideal location for a series of storage reservoirs and power plants. Eastwood was born in Minnesota and came to California in 1878 to work on the Pacific extension of the Minneapolis and St. Louis railroad. After establishing a private engineering firm in Fresno in 1883, Eastwood turned his attention to the Sierras. In 1893 he first visited the present location of Big Creek town, and saw its potential as the anchor point of a huge hydroelectric generating system. However, demand, distribution, and transmission networks for such quantities of power did not yet exist in California.[18]

By 1895, Eastwood had shown that high-head hydroelectric plants were feasible in the area by developing a plant further down the San Joaquin River for the San Joaquin Electrical Company (today the site of Pacific Gas & Electric Company's Wishon powerhouse). The San Joaquin Electrical Company soon went bankrupt, however, and in 1900 Eastwood turned in earnest to planning and surveying the Big Creek system, securing water rights and identifying locations for

---

[15] Hay, *Hydroelectric Development*, 30; Thomas P. Hughes, *Networks of Power: Electrification in Western Society, 1880-1930* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 277.

[16] Quoted in Hughes, *Networks of Power*, 265.

[17] P.M. Downing, O.B. Caldwell, E.R. Davis, W.G.B. Euler, and C.C. MacCalla, "Report of the Sub-committee on Water Development on the Pacific Coast," in National Electric Light Association *Papers Reports and Discussions, Hydro-Electric and Transmission Sections Technical Sessions, National Electric Light Association Thirty-Eight Convention* (San Francisco: National Electric Light Association, 1915) 594-601; Federal Power Commission, *Directory of Electric Generating Plants* (Washington, D.C.: Federal Power Commission, 1941), 14-21; U.S. Department of Energy, *Inventory of Power Plants in the United States, 1981 Annual* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy), 41-54.

[18] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 55-59; Charles A. Whitney, "John Eastwood: Unsung Genius of the Drawing Board," *Montana: The Magazine of Western History*, Summer 1969, 38, 41.

tunnels, dams, and power plants.[19] These plans, however, only came to fruition when Eastwood's engineering vision was combined with Southern California capital, in the person of Henry Huntington.

Huntington was born in 1850 in Oneonta, New York. His uncle Collis P. Huntington was the force behind the consolidation of the Southern Pacific Railroad. After the death of his uncle, and determined to make his own mark on the industry, Henry Huntington sold his Southern Pacific stock in 1901 and moved to Los Angeles. He became a major figure in the development of the Los Angeles region through his consolidation of street railroads, public utilities, and large real estate holdings. By acquiring land and then connecting it to the metropolis by electric railroad, Huntington was able to sell suburban parcels at hefty profits.[20]

Huntington's expanding network of street railroads depended on a reliable and inexpensive source of electrical power. In 1902, he joined with Allan C. Balch and William G. Kerckhoff to found Pacific Light and Power Company for this purpose. Kerckhoff was born in 1856 and moved to Los Angeles with his family in 1878. Through his father's lumber company he acquired an interest in the San Gabriel Valley Rapid Transit Railway, which was later absorbed by the Southern Pacific. Balch, born in New York in 1864, was trained as an electrical engineer and managed a steam-electric plant in Portland before moving to Los Angeles in 1896. Together, Balch and Kerckhoff founded the San Gabriel Electric Company, which brought them into contact with Henry Huntington.[21]

Huntington was looking for sources of electrical power, while Balch and Kerckhoff had successfully developed a hydroelectric plant on the San Gabriel River, and were proceeding with plans for another on the Kern River, 100 miles to the north. In 1901 and 1902 the three men founded Pacific Light and Power Company with the short-term aim of supplying cheap power to the street railroads, with the eventual aim of consolidating the electric utilities of the greater Los Angeles area into a monopoly.[22] Initially, 51 percent of the company was owned by the Los Angeles Railroad, in which Henry Huntington held a 55 percent interest, with the remainder owned by the Southern Pacific. Balch and Kerckhoff owned 40 percent of Pacific Light and Power, and appointed three of the seven directors, while Huntington named the rest. The intimate relationship between power and railroads at this early date is evidenced by the fact that the power company was formed as a subsidiary of the railroad, and not the other way around.

Kerckhoff and Balch acquired Fresno's San Joaquin Electric Light and Power in late 1902 as a large source of low cost power that could meet the projected demands of the fast-growing metropolis of Los Angeles.[23] At the time, John Eastwood was Vice President and Chief Engineer of San Joaquin Electric Light and Power. Balch and Kerckhoff were receptive to Eastwood's plans for Big Creek, and hired him in July 1902 to fully plan the system. Eastwood immediately began filing water rights claims and by late 1903 had claimed over 410,000 miner's inches of

---

[19] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 60-62; Redinger, *Story of Big Creek*, 6.
[20] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 66.
[21] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 67-69.
[22] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 74.
[23] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 71.

water in the basin.[24] By 1905, Eastwood had prepared plans for a system of powerhouses and transmission lines that by his estimate would offer considerable savings over similarly sized steam plants.[25] Pacific Light and Power's directors, however, were uncertain whether existing demand could absorb the huge quantities of power that Eastwood's proposed plants would generate, and decided in 1903 to prioritize steam development over hydroelectric. As a result, the period up to 1910 saw little progress on the Big Creek project.

Despite this delay, Eastwood continued to file water claims and began securing permits from the U.S. Department of the Interior to develop the hydroelectric plants, which are located on Federal land on the Sierra National Forest. Road permits were granted in 1903-1904 and comprehensive permits for the initial Big Creek development issued in 1909.[26] In 1906 Pacific Light and Power reached an agreement with Miller and Lux, a land and livestock company holding much of the downstream water rights on the San Joaquin River, and in late 1905 construction of a road from Shaver (then a timber camp) to the Big Creek basin was begun. Another route, from Auberry to Camp 1 (the site of today's Big Creek town), was begun in 1908.[27]

By 1905, Eastwood had outlined his vision for the initial development of the Big Creek system. He identified the later locations of Powerhouses 1 and 2 as the sites for two powerhouses with 2050 and 1861 feet of head, respectively. In his proposal, each plant would have six 7,500 horsepower (hp) water wheels generating over 40,000hp of electricity. His projected power lines were to transmit either at 66kV or 88kV. His design for the powerhouses proposed a separation between the generators, transformers, and transmission equipment:

> The portion to be blasted out will not be great, as the buildings will be narrow, and the outer walls will be carried up, and the floors leveled with broken rock, the buildings rising one above another in steps, the generator house first, the transformer house next, and the line house and tower at the top…
>
> The generator house will be located nearly on a level with the bed rock at the creek, and parallel with the creek channel, the inner edge being blasted out of the bluff, and the outer edge being built up to bring the floor up to a level.
>
> This building will need to be 210 feet long, inside and 40 feet wide, with an alcove to accommodate the exciters and the switching gallery… The transformer house will be separated from the generator room by a fire wall the entire hight [sic] of the building, and separate stalls provided for the transformers, and will lighted [sic] from a skylight and from windows arranged above the traveling crane, and at the ends of the building, and will be 210 x 30 feet inside.

---

[24] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 75.
[25] John S. Eastwood, "Comparative Estimate of Cost of Water-Power Transmission Plant vs. Steam Plant, for W.G. Kerckhoff, President, Pacific Light and Power Company," 1905, Document No. 12871, in History and Information File, Northern Hydro Division Headquarters Library, Big Creek, California.
[26] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 82.
[27] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 83.

> The line house and tower, will contain the lightning arresters, and the maintransmission line terminals, and will be built with a dead wall in front, and lighted from the upper side, and will be 60 feet long and 30 feet wide inside, surmounted by a tower 24 feet square inside, provided with open ports for the exit of the lines.
> There is no reason why, with the almost ideal conditions to be met at this site, it should not be a model plant, not only from the point of permanency, economy and certainly of output, but in the way of tasteful and convenient design and architecture as well, in as full a degree as consistant [sic] with its location and uses.[28]

Although the eventual design of Powerhouses 1 and 2 departed considerably from Eastwood's original vision, many of the principles laid out in this initial design remained the same: the creekside location, the length of the building, the use of fire walls to separate equipment, and the separation of transformers in stalls. Eastwood was in fact ahead of his time in proposing the physical separation of different functional elements of the plant, an approach to powerhouse construction that become standard after the early 1920s.

He also identified locations for Powerhouse 3 and a larger Shaver Dam (then owned by the Fresno Flume and Lumber Company), and anticipated the use of water from Mono Creek and Mammoth Lakes. As we will see below, all of these facilities were eventually constructed in the locations proposed by Eastwood – although the power eventually supplied by the system was considerably more than even he anticipated.[29]

By 1909-1910, Huntington, Kerckhoff, and Balch began seriously considering the fulfillment of Eastwood's hydroelectric plans. A consultant estimated the cost of the two initial power plants at $12.34 million. To ensure the soundness of the investment, Huntington hired the Chief Engineer of the Southern Pacific Railroad to estimate the potential revenues from the project. The assessment concluded that the Big Creek system would lose money. Rather than canceling the project, however, Balch and Kerckhoff ordered construction of a weir to more precisely calculate water flows on Big Creek.[30]

Meanwhile, Huntington was taking steps to raise capital for the project. Pacific Light and Power Company was recapitalized in late 1909 with the help of eastern bankers and sold new bonds to raise money for the Big Creek project. At the same time, Huntington eliminated the Southern Pacific Company from the project by trading one of his interurban electric lines in Los Angeles for the Southern Pacific's 45 percent stake in the Los Angeles Railroad, Pacific Light and Power's holding company. In 1910, Balch exercised his option to buy the plans, water rights, and permits for Big Creek, all of which were held in Eastwood's name. Eastwood received 10 percent of the stock of the new Pacific Light and Power Corporation.[31] Huntington, however,

---

[28] John S. Eastwood, "Progress Report for 1903-1904 of Right of Way Surveys and Outline Plan for Power Plant No. 1," 1904, 38-39, in Folder 11, Box 302, Southern California Edison Papers, Huntington Library, San Marino California.
[29] Eastwood, "Comparative Estimate."
[30] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 85-86.
[31] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 85.

used special assessments on shareholders to force Eastwood to sell his stock cheaply, depriving him of his hoped-for wealth. Despite his visionary role in designing the Big Creek project, Eastwood was excluded from involvement in its construction and ultimately received no financial reward for his work. Balch and Kerckhoff also sold their interests to Huntington about this time, leaving him with full control of the company. About the same time, in October-November 1911, Huntington secured financial backing from a syndicate of New York bankers that allowed construction to proceed.[32]

Initial Construction, 1910-1913

Once the financial resources to construct the project had been secured, construction was ready to begin. Pacific Light and Power, however, lacked the large workforce or engineering expertise to quickly begin construction. Instead, it hired the Boston-based Stone and Webster Construction Company to design and manage the construction. The contract with Stone and Webster covered the construction of the 56-mile San Joaquin and Eastern Railroad, three dams to create Huntington Lake, Powerhouses 1 and 2, the 240-mile transmission line to Los Angeles, and the necessary forebays, tunnels, and penstocks.[33] Authorization to begin construction of the railroad was given on January 26, 1912.

Work on the railroad proceeded in a climate of secrecy, since all of the necessary rights-of-way had not yet been secured. Construction of the railroad raised difficult engineering problems. Most famously, one section of the route passed across a bedrock face on tracks bolted directly to the stone. The railroad was completed on July 12, 1912 – only 165 days after work began.[34]

The development as executed by Stone and Webster followed Eastwood's plans in the main, although Stone and Webster's engineers favored different architectural and engineering solutions: their engineers built Cyclopean masonry dams with gravity sections rather than his proposed earth dams, and combined the generation and transmission facilities in a single structure rather than separating them in detached buildings as Eastwood had proposed.[35]

In March 1912, blasting for the dam sites and tunnels began. Over the summer of 1912, 3,500 men were at work in 12 camps scattered across the construction area. Dam and tunnel construction continued until the end of 1912. Huntington, Balch, and Pacific Light and Power Vice President George C. Ward visited the site of construction in July 1912, in what was to be Huntington's only visit to Big Creek. Preparations for constructing Powerhouses 1 and 2 commenced in late 1912, when Stone and Webster established a sawmill to cut timber logged out of the area. The lumber would be used for construction forms for the powerhouses. At the end of 1912 excavation for the foundations of Powerhouse 1 were well underway.[36] At the same time,

---

[32] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 85, 92.
[33] Redinger, *The Story of Big Creek*, 11; W. Sohier, *The Big Creek Project, A History, December 27, 1917*, typescript, 9-10, in Folder 7, Box 302, Southern California Edison Papers, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
[34] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 95.
[35] Eastwood, "Progress Report."
[36] Stone and Webster Construction Company, "Progress of the Big Creek Initial Development: Report to Pacific Light and Power Corporation, January 1, 1913," 3, in Water Resources Library, University of California, Berkeley.

the process of securing final permits from the Department of Agriculture (the parent agency of the U.S. Forest Service) continued. Ward filed the application for a final Power Permit on July 16, 1912 with amendments in November. The Department of Agriculture was apparently slow to respond, for Southern California Edison archives contains a letter of March 1913 noting that issuance of the permit was an urgent matter, since construction work was well underway. It was not until July 16, 1913 that the Department of Agriculture finally issued the final power permit for Big Creek Powerhouses 1 and 2.[37]

The pivotal construction year of 1913 opened with bad weather and a general strike. Working conditions were difficult: workers complained of long days and bad food, while typhoid and other diseases struck the camps. Accidents killed or maimed several workers, sparking a visit from the state labor commissioner in late 1912.[38] When several men were fired for trying to attack one of the cooks, over 2,000 men went out on a strike led by members of the Industrial Workers of the World, a radical anarcho-syndicalist union. Demands included time-and-a-half pay for overtime, hot water in the washrooms, better sleeping quarters, access to doctors, and better food. The strike began at Camp No. 3 on January 7 and spread quickly to the others. In response, Stone and Webster closed the mess halls, locked out its employees, and suspended work at Big Creek. Almost 2,000 men were fired outright, and striking workers had no choice but to leave the area.

The record snowfall that fell that week provided a convenient excuse for suspending the project while Stone and Webster hired a new workforce. By January 25, construction on the powerhouses had resumed.[39] Between the strike and the bad weather, however, the Big Creek project had fallen behind schedule. Originally set for completion on July 1 and October 1, 1913, Powerhouses 1 and 2 were not completed until November and December. This delay reduced the projected revenues from the plants, requiring Pacific Light and Power to raise additional funds to complete construction and causing the temporary layoff of some of the construction workforce.[40]

In March, 1913, excavation had been completed and the foundation of Powerhouse 1 was poured.[41] The powerhouse structure was built in just three months, with the roof finished on July 18, 1913. Construction of Powerhouse 2 proceeded simultaneously but was about two months behind Powerhouse 1. The basement of Powerhouse 1 was under construction by May and the roof was in place by October. The generators first went on line on October 14, 1913, though the plant did not begin transmitting power to the Eagle Rock substation in Los Angeles until November 8.

The structure of Powerhouse 2 was almost complete in mid-October of 1913. However, on October 17, 1913, a fire swept through the upper floors of the nearly-complete powerhouse, destroying part of the roof, the internal partitions on the upper floors, and some of the equipment.

---

[37] Sohier, "The Big Creek Project," 26. More information on Big Creek permits up to 1957 is held in Folder 6, Box 302, Southern California Edison Collection, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.
[38] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 127.
[39] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 132.
[40] Stone and Webster, "Progress," 3; Kelley, *Valuation*, 8.
[41] Redinger, *Story of Big Creek*, 30.

This fire seems to have been begun accidentally in the small saw mill attached to the construction site, though Southern California Edison's 1922 Valuation of Powerhouse 2 suggests that it was of an 'incendiary nature,' hinting that it may have been a case of arson.[42] Powerhouse 2 Unit 1 did not go online until December 8, 1913, and Unit 2 began transmitting on January 11, 1914.[43]

When the initial phase of Big Creek was complete, the two powerhouses had four generating units producing 80,000 horsepower and using some of the highest heads in the country. At 240 miles long, the power lines connecting Big Creek with Los Angeles were among the world's longest, and set a new record for using 150kV in commercial transmission. The vision of Big Creek as an integrated system of plants which could be added to was also ahead of its time and anticipated the interconnected systems that characterize power production and transmission today.

Other large plants built about this time, such as Keokuk (Illinois) and Conowingo (Maryland), generated more power, but none were built under conditions as difficult as those at Big Creek. The difficult mountain terrain, high heads, and huge turbines gave the Big Creek plant an essentially experimental character. *Electrical World* recognized the feats achieved in the initial construction of the system as "one of the most advanced contributions of the engineer to the welfare of civilization."[44]

Intermission, 1914-1919

While Big Creek Powerhouses 1 and 2 were designed for later expansion, the onset of the European war in late 1914 affected both the American credit markets and power consumption. It became difficult for companies such as Pacific Light and Power to raise money for capital projects, while electrical demand in Los Angeles was not growing fast enough to require immediate construction of additional power plants or generating units.[45]

Despite this relative lull, some construction did continue at Big Creek. Crews began work on Tunnel 3, which was to connect Powerhouse 2 to the proposed Big Creek No. 3 development. However, only 2050' of tunnel were bored between July 1914 and February 1920. In summer 1917, the three dams at Huntington Lake were raised to an elevation of 6950', increasing the lake's storage capacity and allowing the later installation of a third generating unit in Powerhouse 2.[46]

More significant for the future development of the Big Creek system was the 1917 merger between Pacific Light and Power (PLP) and Southern California Edison (SCE). Henry Huntington had dreamed since at least 1902 of consolidating southern California utilities under his control. The merger, which was accomplished through a swap of PLP and SCE stock, made

---

[42] "Fire at Big Creek Causes Damage of $10,000," *Fresno Morning Republican*, October 20, 1913.
[43] Redinger, *Story of Big Creek*, 31-32.
[44] "The 150,000-Volt Big Creek Development—I," *Electrical World*, January 3, 1914, 33.
[45] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 153.
[46] David H. Redinger, "Progress on the Big Creek Hydro-Electric Project, Part I," *Compressed Air Magazine*, December 1923, 722.

sense from a business point of view. PLP had extensive street railroad interests but limited residential service, and the Big Creek plants provided more electricity than it could use. Edison, on the other hand, had a rapidly expanding residential business and was facing a looming shortfall of generation capacity. The two systems complemented each other, as the California Railroad Commission observed when it approved of the merger in 1917. As *Electrical World* noted at the time,

> this merger of what are really vast interests is undoubtedly along the lines of wise business policy. The two electric companies have been operating side by side in a rapidly growing territory, competing keenly for business in a number of centers, and to some extent duplicating investment and wasting energy which could be better utilized in other directions.[47]

The newly merged company had two vice presidents from the Pacific Light and Power side, R.H. Ballard (formerly corporate secretary) and George C. Ward (formerly vice president), while Henry Huntington, his son Howard, and his lawyer W.E. Dunn each took seats on the Board of Directors.

After the end of the First World War in late 1918, an economic boom began. Capital was again available, and rapid urban and industrial growth in Los Angeles had radically increased demand for electricity. A new source of energy was needed quickly. As a result, the previously modest expansion plans for Big Creek were accelerated.[48] In October 1920 Southern California Edison applied to the California Railroad Commission for approval of their proposal to expand Powerhouse 1 and construct two new powerhouses, to be called Powerhouse 3 and Powerhouse 8. Permission was granted in Railroad Commission decision 8569 on January 20, 1921.[49]

The original plans for Powerhouse 3 had called for it to utilize a head similar to Powerhouses 1 and 2 (1500'). The development of more efficient vertical turbines in the intervening years, however, made it possible to extract more power from a lower head. As a result Edison decided to divide the head originally intended for Powerhouse 3 into two power plants. Powerhouse 8 (so numbered because numbers up to 7 had already been used in Federal permit applications) was to be built first at the junction of Big Creek and the San Joaquin River. The construction of Powerhouse 8 in early 1921 set off a period of continuous expansion of the Big Creek system that lasted, almost without interruption, until 1929.

The Big Creek Community on the Eve of the Great Expansion

The 1920 United States Census was conducted just as the great expansion of the Big Creek system was getting underway. While the population of the region would eventually swell to over 5,000 at the height of construction work, only 535 people lived in the "Cascada Precinct" of Fresno County when the census was conducted in 1920. The precinct included the town of Cascada (renamed Big Creek in 1926) and the nearby construction camps. The census data

---

[47] "Merger of California Hydroelectric Systems," *Electrical World*, December 9, 1916, 1134.
[48] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 162.
[49] Noted in an untitled memorandum in Folder 6, Box 302, Southern California Edison Collection, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

provides us a snapshot of the community and its demographics that provides some insight into the social world of Big Creek in the early period of its operation.[50]

The Big Creek community in 1920 was overwhelmingly male, with 426 adult men but only fifty-eight women and fifty children. There were only fifty-two married couples in the community, although ninety-four men were listed as married. While some of the married couples took on individual boarders, most of the men lived in boarding houses or bunkhouses with from ten to fifty-six occupants. This dense occupancy is reflected in the fact that the area contained only seventy-nine dwellings for 535 people.

Twenty-three of the married couples had children. Of the fifty-eight women residing in the Cascada precinct, fifty-two were married, three widowed, and three single. Two of the single women, aged 19 and 21, were the eldest daughters of a foreman. The other, aged 21, was the grammar school teacher. Two of the widowed women, aged 61 and 60, lived in Big Creek with their working sons. A 35 year-old widow, living with her 7-year-old son, was the proprietor of one of the boarding houses.

The vast majority of employment in the Cascada Precinct was through Southern California Edison: of the 432 adults with jobs, 365 worked for the "power company" or within a "power company camp." Another thirty-five men worked for the San Joaquin and Eastern Railroad, also owned by Southern California Edison. Twenty men worked in construction, at a warehouse, or in a sawmill – possibly the employees of the Fresno Lumber and Irrigation Company in the town of Shaver, now Shaver Lake. The remaining residents, twelve in number, were shopkeepers, hotel operators, or providers of other basic services. Cascada, in other words, was a company town fully dependent on the Big Creek powerhouses.

Over half (189) of the Edison employees were recorded in the 1920 census as "laborers." Others had more skilled employment as carpenters (35), mechanics or machinists (18), engineers (18), electricians (10), teamsters (13), and clerks. Other jobs include blacksmiths, timekeepers, painters, miners, riggers, pipefitters, and cement workers. Supporting the community were fourteen cooks, twelve waiters, five storekeepers, four boarding house workers, two nurses, a doctor, and a grammar school teacher. The average age of Edison employees at the time of the census was 37.

Most residents of the Big Creek area in 1920 were native-born Americans, and all listed their race as "white." Only around one third were foreign born, and most of these had come from northwest Europe. More than twenty nations of origin were represented in the community. The largest group was Irish (21), followed by English (16), Swedish (14), Canadian (13), German (12), Scottish (8), Italian (8), and Russian (7). All of the foreign-born came from either Europe or Canada, except one from Siberia, one from Chile, and one from South Africa. Over two-thirds of the foreign-born workers, however, had been in the U.S. more than ten years.

[50] Fourteenth Census of the United States, Cascada Precinct, Fresno County, California.

Powerhouse 8: The "Ninety Day Wonder"
This community would soon be swelled by the addition of thousands of new construction workers. The great expansion of the Big Creek system began in early 1921, when the construction of Powerhouse 8 began. Excavation for the foundation of Powerhouse 8 took place between January and early May, with the first concrete was poured for its foundation on May 12. The turbine parts were assembled as concrete was being poured for the powerhouse structure, and installation of Unit 1 commenced in June. On August 11, Powerhouse 8 began generating power, and was connected to the system on August 16.[51]

Powerhouse 8 was a pioneer facility in several respects: it was the first commercial powerhouse ever designed for 220kV transmission, it was among the first to use the improved Francis-type vertical reaction turbine, and its generation capacity from the single initial turbine almost matched that of both units in Powerhouse 1 (27,000kW compared to 28,000kW). Powerhouse 8 also set records for the speed of construction, which continued twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week and earned the plant the moniker of the 'Ninety-day wonder.'[52]

Powerhouse 3: "The Electrical Giant of the West"
In September 1921, soon after the completion of Powerhouse 8, construction began on the tunnels, forebays, and penstocks for Powerhouse 3. The three initial units of Powerhouse 3, "the electrical giant of the West," were placed online on September 30, October 2, and October 5, 1923.[53] The three units of Big Creek No. 3 made up the largest hydroelectric plant in the west at the time of their construction, with an aggregate capacity of 75,000 kW.

Additional Units and 220kV Transmission
Each of the Big Creek powerhouses was designed for later expansion. Work on a third generating unit at Big Creek No. 2 was authorized in late 1918 and began in summer 1920. Structural work was completed that November, and the new unit was paralleled to the system on February 1, 1921. The Shaver Tunnel was also begun in February 1920 and completed in May 1921. This tunnel diverted water from Shaver Lake into the Big Creek drainage, allowing its use in Powerhouse 2 and the plants below. Initially this water was simply diverted into the Powerhouse 2 forebay, though it was later used in Powerhouses 2A, 3, and 8 upon their completion.

Work to convert Big Creek's 150kV transmission system to 220kV was completed on May 6, 1923, when the Big Creek system began transmitting at the highest voltage used commercially anywhere in the world.[54] In July 1923 Powerhouse 1 was expanded to add a third unit, which was brought on line on July 12. In late 1924 and 1925 Powerhouses 1 and 2 were expanded to

---

[51] "Big Creek No. 8 Hydro-Electric Unit Completed," *Journal of Electricity and Western Industry*, August 11, 1921, 160.
[52] Shoup, *Hardest Working Water*, 190; "First 220,000-Volt Station Completed," *Electrical World*, 117.
[53] David H. Redinger, "Progress on the Big Creek Hydro-Electric Project, Part V," *Compressed Air Magazine*, September 1924, 991; "Southern California Edison Company to Start 150,000-Kw. Station," 636.
[54] "Transmission at 220,000 Volts a Fact," *Electrical World*, May 12, 1923, 1107

their full planned capacity by the addition of a fourth unit to each. This addition required extension of the powerhouse structures by 56' each.[55]

Florence Lake, the Mono-Bear Conduit and Shaver Dam

The later 1920s saw efforts to increase the available water in the Big Creek system by increasing storage capacity and drawing from adjacent watersheds. Between 1925 and 1928, tunnels and dams were built from Mono Creek, Bear Creek, and the south fork of the San Joaquin, while the dam at Shaver Lake was raised to increase its storage capacity.

The years 1925 and 1926 saw the construction of the dams that created Florence Lake on the south fork of the San Joaquin River. Work on the Florence Lake Tunnel (later named the Ward Tunnel for Edison President George C. Ward), which connected the south fork watershed to the Big Creek system, had begun in 1920 and was finished in April 1925. For the dam, a multiple-arch design was chosen, a type pioneered by John S. Eastwood. Construction began in March and was completed in November 1925, although the dam was raised again in 1926.[56] The Mono-Bear diversion drew water from Bear and Mono Creeks, located upstream from Florence Lake, into the Ward Tunnel and thence into Huntington Lake. Constructed between 1925 and 1927, these tunnels required excavation through solid granite.[57]

Shaver Lake, originally built by the Fresno Flume and Lumber Company as part of their logging and sawmill operation, was raised between 1925 and 1927, expanding the lake to 2,200 acres in surface area. The new Shaver Lake was designed to store excess water from Florence and Huntington Lakes and also to make possible new high-head generating units that would be known as Powerhouse 2A.[58]

Powerhouse 2A and the End of the Great Expansion

The availability of water from Florence Lake and Shaver Lake led to the ambitious expansion of Powerhouse 2. Two additional units were constructed in a new building adjacent and connected to the older building. Powerhouse 2A would harness a 2,418' head, the highest in the Big Creek system and one of the highest in the United States. Construction of Powerhouse 2A began in June 1926 and cost $23 million.[59] Units 1 and 2 went online on August 21 and December 21, 1928, respectively.[60] The 56,000 hp turbines and 46,500kW generators were among the largest in the world at the time of their installation. Although Powerhouse 2A drew water from Shaver Lake and had its own transmission line, the new building was operated from the Powerhouse 2 control room.[61]

---

[55] "Big Creek No. 2 Power House Being Extended 56 ft.," *Journal of Electricity* 54 (6): 297; Southern California Edison, "Memorandum, Hydro Generation, Northern Division, Generator Winding Data Revised to May 13, 1985," 1-2, on file, Southern California Edison Northern Hydro Division Headquarters, Big Creek, CA, 1-2.
[56] Redinger, *Story of Big Creek*, 136, 150.
[57] Redinger, *Story of Big Creek*, 149.
[58] Redinger, *Story of Big Creek*, 153.
[59] "Southern California Edison's Advance," *Electrical West*, April 21, 1928, 829.
[60] Southern California Edison, "Memorandum," 3.
[61] Redinger, *Story of Big Creek*, 157; "Southern California Edison's Advance," 829.

When the second unit of Powerhouse 8 went on line in June 1929, the great expansion of the Big Creek system was concluded.[62] Fifteen generating units were in service, with a aggregate capacity of 344,500kW. The system went from generating 213 million kilowatt-hours in 1914 (its first full year of service) to 1.6 billion kilowatts in 1928.[63] From the opening of Powerhouse 1 in 1913 to the end of 1929, the Big Creek system had set a series of records for generation and transmission that earned it a preeminent place among the electrical generating systems of the west and of North America.

Powerhouse	Unit	Capacity (kW)	Installation date
1	1	14,000	1913
	2	14,000	1913
	3	14,000	1923
	4	22,400	1925
2	3	14,000	1913
	4	14,000	1913
	5	14,000	1921
	6	14,000	1924
8	1	22,400	1921
	2	34,000	1929
3	1	25,000	1923
	2	25,000	1923
	3	25,000	1923
2A	1	46,500	1928
	2	46,500	1928
Total	**15**	**344,800**	

Table 1. Big Creek Generating Capacity at the end of the Great Expansion.

Operating the Powerhouses

The degree to which the Big Creek Powerhouses, especially Powerhouses 1 and 2, were experimental technologies can be seen in the daily operators' logs, which remain on file at the plants. The logs reveal how operators dealt with frequent minor mechanical problems, and a few major ones such as penstock breaks. The experience led to innovations in safety procedures, and a focus on accident avoidance that remains a characteristic of Southern California Edison corporate practice today.

[62] "Second Unit Installed at Big Creek Plant No. 8," *Electrical West*, July 1, 1929, 38.
[63] Southern California Edison, *1928 Annual Report, Big Creek Division*, 21, in History and Information File, Northern Hydro Division Headquarters, Big Creek, California.

JOB CLASSIFICATIONS

Big Creek Nos. 1 and 2 began operation in late 1913 with three to five men on duty. Shifts were initially 10 hours, but were reduced to 8 hours by 1920. The plants maintained a three-shift schedule: 8am-4pm, 4pm-midnight, and midnight-8am. These rotations were also observed in Big Creek Nos. 3 and 8 when they came on line in 1921 and 1923 respectively. In 1929 the Big Creek division employed forty-nine powerhouse operators in the four plants, at the grades of "shift operator," "operator," "assistant operator," and "probationer." Besides the operators, each powerhouse had a station chief, assistant chief, electrician, machinist, two utility men, and a cook for the boarding houses.[64]

A shift schedule prepared by Big Creek 8 station chief P.H. Hilbert in early 1926 provides an example of how these classifications were divided into shifts:

	{Shift Operator
A.M Shift	{Switchboard Operator
	{Relief Asst. Operator
	{Asst. Station Chief
Day Shift	{Switchboard Operator
	{Machinist or Electrician
	{Shift Operator
P.M. Shift	{Switchboard Operator
	{Relief Operator or Electrician

Hilbert notes that in this arrangement, the station machinist and station electrician would be each available for maintenance work for twelve days each month.[65] Plant daily logs show that other plants also maintained a workforce of three or four men per shift during the 1920s.

OPERATOR TASKS

The main task of the powerhouse operators was to adjust power production to fluctuations in load on the overall Edison system, which was dependent on demand in the greater Los Angeles area. Most of the operators' daily tasks, however, were more mundane. They included testing equipment, performing routine maintenance, and cleaning the station. The daily log for December 18, 1926 from Big Creek 3 gives the flavor of the work:

[64] Southern California Edison, *1929 Annual Report, Big Creek Division*, 4; Southern California Edison, *1927 Annual Report, Big Creek Division*, see page 29 for operator grades, both in History and Information File, Northern Hydro Division, Big Creek, California.
[65] P.H. Hilbert to R.B. Lawton, "Big Creek No. 8 Operating Shift Schedule," memorandum dated February 19, 1926, in File 29-940.1, Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 8.

12 midnight. Hess, Batzer, Morgan – on. Thompson – off.
Station normal. Greased #3 Turbine and swept kitchenette, washroom, and office. Cleaned door, sinks, urinals, bowls, and tubs in main washroom. Emptied trash barrel from machine shop. Burnt all garbage and swept hallway. Cleaned up a few grease stains on gen. floor.

8am. Lockyer, Leahy, Horr – on. Morgan – off.
Station normal. Repaired opening bolt #15 unit #3 turbine. Took voltage of batt. Swept part of gen. floor. Ran purifier #1 turbine, about 20 gal's water. Wiped #2 turbine.
Station duties – Horr.

4pm. Lee, Strain, Thompson – on. Horr – off.
Station O.K. Wound Venturi Meters. Wiped #1 Turbine and room. Took specific gravity of station batteries and of three cells of A and B Carrier Current Telephone Batteries. Cleaned windows along North wall on generator floor. Cleaned and mopped Kitchenette. Greased #1 H. [house] Set, and water pumps. Changed pumps and compressors.
Station duties – Thompson.[66]

The handwritten logs, which are extant for all four powerhouses, offer meticulous detail about the working lives of their operators during the period of significance.

THE EVOLUTION OF SAFETY PRACTICE

The Big Creek plants deployed cutting-edge technology for their day. Innovation, however, brought with it both hazards and significant technical challenges. In the early period of operation it was the penstocks in particular which provided many of the mechanical failures in the plant. The first such incident occurred at Powerhouse 1 just after 1 am on December 1, 1913, only a few months after the plant was placed in service. A broken penstock joint sent water and debris cascading down the hill and against the back wall of the plant. A.C. Prigmore, the station chief, reported:

> Tried to notify Mr. Lawton by phone but found telephone line shorted and sent up messenger, by this time water had raised up back of building to the window sills and rear door gave way letting flood in between agitators thru be plates of exciters and down into basement. Notified Eagle Rock we would have to shut down at once… Water level in generator pits [was] about a foot and a half above bottom each. Entire length of basement passage filled with sand and rubbish to within a foot of the ceiling, most of it comming *[sic]* in from opening at the West end of building. Sand and rocks covered the floor around the agitators to the top of the foundations.[67]

It took two weeks to return the plant to operative condition.

[66] Big Creek No. 3, *Floor Log Volume 11 (1926-1927)*, 97, in Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 3.
[67] Big Creek No. 1, *Daily Log*, December 1, 1913, in Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 1.

A worse accident occurred on March 14, 1924, at Big Creek No. 3. A machinist named Johnson and his helper Childs were working on a stuck plunger valve inside Penstock Number 3 when water rushed into the pipe. As the investigative committee reported:

> The helper was close to the manhole and succeeded in getting out. Johnson was caught and killed, his body being torn to pieces and forced out through the turbine relief valve. Water was discharged through the manhole and tore a large hole in the roof, spouting a hundred feet or more above the powerhouse. Part of the air duct for #3 generator was torn away and several windows between the generator room and gallery were broken. The power house was flooded, several inches above the main floor.[68]

Johnson's death led to serious introspection in the Big Creek Division. The investigative committee determined that the accident occurred because "responsibility [was] divided between operating and construction organizations and the lack of definite rules as to obtaining clearances to do construction and repair work."[69]

In response, the committee recommended improvements to mechanical safety, including mechanical locks on valves and disconnection of electricity to forebay gates during penstock maintenance. They also recommended that definite rules be established for obtaining maintenance clearances. The procedures suggested by the committee were implemented quickly. Powerhouse daily logs and floor logs from the mid-1920s show that new clearance forms were used when maintenance was required on potentially dangerous machinery such as valve pits and governors. The forms named the employee cleared to do the work, and were countersigned by the station chief and dispatcher. The apparatus itself was checked by two further employees, and the final clearance to begin the work signed by the foreman on duty.[70] By ensuring that everyone on duty knew that the work was being performed, the new procedure responded to the failures in communication that were evident in the 1924 tragedy.

Beyond these specific procedures, an increasing emphasis on safe working conditions evolved in the Edison organization during the 1920s. Weekly letter reports and annual reports prepared by Station Chiefs track the number of injuries and days lost to illness, with evident pride when the numbers remained low. The Big Creek Division Report for 1927, for instance, notes only 296 hours off for sickness and 164 off for injury out of 244,078 payroll hours – barely one-fifth of 1 percent.

> A mistake in switching at Big Creek #3 on June 12, 1927, is the only mistake we have to report for the entire Big Creek Division.
>
> Big Creek Plants numbers 1 – 2 and 8 have a clear record for two years. No avoidable accidents to employee in any plant.

---

[68] W.R. Battey, George C. Heckman, and J.M. Gaylord to Mr. B.F. Pearson, letter regarding the Big Creek Number 3 penstock accident, March 19, 1924, in Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 3, Big Creek, CA.
[69] Battey et al., to Pearson.
[70] An example of this form can be seen in Big Creek No. 3, *Floor Log Volume 12 (1927)*, 193, in Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 3.

> A great deal of credit is due to Careful Clubs, Station Chiefs and Employees for the interest they are taking in this branch of the work.
>
> The Big Creek Division Maintenance Crew has a clear record for the last two years. No accidents or mistakes resulting in damage to property or injury to person.[71]

The company established Careful Clubs to provide safety training at each powerhouse, with rewards for stations and individuals for maintaining a clean safety record for periods of six months, one year, and two years. This emphasis on safety practice represents the early phase of the 'safety first' culture that remains a hallmark of Big Creek operations today.

RETENTION AND TRAINING

Given the isolation and harsh winter climate of the Big Creek area, recruiting and retention of skilled employees was an ongoing problem. In an early 1922 letter to Southern California Edison's Superintendant of Generation, the Big Creek superintendant wrote of the difficulties he faced:

> As the annual vacation period is near at hand, and it will be necessary at that time to secure relief for the three Big Creek plants, writer would suggest that an effort be made to secure a better class of men than we have been getting in the past. By a better class of men I mean men that have received at least a high school education, and some technical as well if possible, and who have had some mechanical and electrical experience… We have filled our plants with men who in the majority of cases were simply looking for a job. The result is that out of the entire Big Creek operating organization, only a very small percentage have the inclination or ability to fit themselves for responsible positions. The operation of the plants and system is going to become increasingly difficult and complicated by the addition of more and larger plants and units, automatic and semi-automatic protective equipment and increased transmission voltage and in the writer's opinion is going to require a much higher grade of men to successfully and properly handle this equipment than we have been getting the last few years.[72]

Another dimension of the problem was the very high employee turnover experienced at Big Creek, especially in the construction workforce. As the shareholder magazine *Edison Partners* magazine reported in 1923:

> Under the plan of permanent organization of the construction forces the labor turnover on the Big Creek-San Joaquin project has been constantly decreasing, until the average for the past year was forty per cent, and the lowest average for any month twenty-six percent. Good living conditions, excellent food, commissary stores which sell everything from clothing to cigarettes at the same prices that obtain in the large cities, amusements,

---

[71] Southern California Edison, *1927 Annual Report*, 28.

[72] R.B. Lawton to D.D. Morgan, "Operating Force – Big Creek," undated memorandum, probably 1922, in File 29-939, Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 8, Big Creek, CA.

> recreation halls, and greatest of all, that intangible thing which can perhaps be termed "camaraderie" and co-operation tend to contentment among the men, and a desire to consider the project in the nature of a life work.[73]

Despite the rosy prose, the writer concedes an average of forty percent turnover *per month* in the construction workforce, suggesting that many of the workers on the construction jobs at Big Creek during this time found the work too hard, the conditions too isolated, or the pay too low to remain on the job for more than a few months.

This level of turnover may have been specific to the Construction Department.[74] The 1927 Annual Report for the Big Creek Division shows that only 37 of 139 employees left during the year, an annual turnover rate of 26.6 percent (or 2.2 percent per month) Of these, fourteen received transfers within the Edison organization, "in most cases at the request of the company."[75] While this remains a high rate, it suggests that the permanent operating employees at Big Creek had more satisfaction with their work.

To address these problems, Edison implemented programs in the mid-1920s to improve employee education and retention. These often began with basic mathematics. As Big Creek 3 Station Chief O.C. Bangsbury reported in 1927:

> As has been requested, regular classes will be held once a week, starting with Shop Arithmetic. The class has been organized and the first meeting is scheduled to be held Wednesday evening, April 27th. A record is to be kept of each member's work and the progress of the class will be kept in step with that of the classes at the other plants so that men transferring from one plant to another will have no difficulty in continuing with the work.[76]

This policy was implemented throughout the Big Creek system. The 1927 *Annual Report* notes that the number of employees enrolled in study programs increased from 52 percent in 1926 to 68 percent in 1927.[77] At the same time, recruitment of new employees seems to have improved: the 1928 Divisional Report noted that "a number of high grade men have been sent in" but also that "the labor turnover, with this class of men, will be somewhat greater… especially college men, are not satisfied to remain as plant operators."[78] The Big Creek management faced a dilemma: intelligent and educated employees were needed to staff the complex powerhouses, but these same people could also find jobs elsewhere in less isolated places than the mountains around Big Creek.

---

[73] "Contented Labor," *Edison Partners*, 6.
[74] Employees on the construction job were hired through the Southern California Edison Construction Department, while the operating employees were employed by the Big Creek Division (later the Northern Hydro Division) of the Power Generation Department.
[75] Southern California Edison, *1927 Annual Report*, 27. Similar figures are reported in the 1928 and 1929 annual reports.
[76] O.C. Bangsbury, "Weekly Letter Report, B.C. 3, April 16, 1927," 2, in Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 3.
[77] Southern California Edison, *1927 Annual Report*, 29.
[78] Southern California Edison, *1928 Annual Report*, 13.

Edison did make efforts to provide amenities and community-building measures to encourage employees to stay. For instance, losses were anticipated in the commissaries and cookhouses provided for the construction workforce, and the total losses averaged into the cost of construction of the powerhouses.[79]

Though many single men remained in bunkhouses, married men and supervisors often became eligible to live in one of the cottages constructed in Big Creek and at the camps close to the lower powerhouses.

> Their pretty cottage homes, which surround the powerhouses, are equipped with everything that is newest and best in sanitation and electrics. Some of the powerhouse colonies have lawn tennis courts and swimming pools; new books are carried to the powerhouse people from nearby public libraries at frequent intervals, and every now and then a welfare agent comes along with a portable motion picture machine, and shows them the latest "movies."
>
> To "The People Who Live in the Powerhouses" the radio has been a great blessing. They get the news of the day and night as it is read by the broadcasters in the big newspaper offices, and the listen to the entertaining lectures and beautiful concerts which the radio service of the city newspapers is now providing.[80]

The company also sponsored a social institution, the Edison Clubs, which were located at each powerhouse and in Big Creek.[81] The Edison Clubs sponsored dances, kept a library and newspaper subscriptions, and organized other events such as card parties, picnics, film screenings, and miniature golf outings. Outside of Big Creek town, the powerhouses also maintained small commissaries. The clubs were maintained by a combination of employee dues (.50 per month in 1931) and company subsidies.[82]

Big Creek in Context

Between late 1911, when construction began on Big Creek Powerhouse 1, and 1929, when Powerhouse 2A was completed, the Big Creek region was transformed from inaccessible wilderness to an industrial landscape and company town intimately connected to the economy of greater Los Angeles. Each phase of the great expansion was marked by pioneering technical achievements in transportation, dam building, tunnel driving, powerhouse design, and transmission line construction. In the process, a community developed that was marked by a combination of pioneer spirit and corporate paternalism. For many who worked in Big Creek, such as David Redinger, the experience was one that defined their lives.

---

[79] In Arthur Kelley's unit cost developments and price books for the Big Creek plants, these losses are included in the cost of materials and labor, suggesting that the company saw these subsidies as a routine construction expense.
[80] "People Who Live in Powerhouses," *Edison Partners*, 11.
[81] For more discussion of the Edison Clubs and their social role, see Shoup, *Life at Big Creek*, 6-8.
[82] Edison Club #28, "Minutes of regular monthly meeting, held Thursday, October 5th, 1933," in Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 2/2A; Edison Club #21, "Minutes, Regular Meeting, December 3, 1931," in Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 1.

TECHNOLOGY AND STRUCTURAL DESIGN

Structural Design and Plant Layout

Structure and Framing

Big Creek Powerhouse 3 is a reinforced concrete and steel structure on a foundation of reinforced concrete that reaches to bedrock. The main generating building was 205'-0" long, 56'-6½" wide and 66'-11" high when built in 1923. Attached to the rear of the generating building is a smaller, two-story building 165'-5" long, 24' wide and 38'-5" high which holds the control, maintenance, and switching rooms. The building sits on a platform 138'-9½" long that extends over the tailraces. The 37' of platform extending behind the powerhouse building holds the low-tension buses and 220kV transformers. CA-167-H-46 depicts the steel framing of the building.

Window Sash

Window openings in the building are a mix of fixed and moving sash. Most window openings have a central portion that opens on a horizontal pivot. Two sash operators were located on the south wall of the main generating floor, and one each on the east and west walls (see CA-167-H-47 for detail).

Generating Floor

The main generator room had space for four generating units on initial construction, though it was ultimately planned for six. CA-167-H-47 offers a plan of this floor. The access bridge over Mill Creek led to the main rolling door to the plant, at the west side of the building (Views CA-167-H-5, CA-167-H-6). Behind the door is an entrance area 43' long and 56'-6" wide. The rest of the generating floor was divided into four spaces of 40' by 56'-6", each holding one generating unit. South of the east-west centerline of the generators, the southern portion of the floor was open to the basement (Views CA-167-H- 23, CA-167-H-24). This split-level design made it easier to inspect both the generators and turbines from below, and allowed all of the plant's major equipment to be seen from the gallery above. Press coverage of the plant noted the design for its convenience and the better view of the equipment that it offered the operators.[83]

Each unit also had a governor located behind the generator along its centerline, an air duct connecting the unit to the south wall, and a staircase leading down to the lower level. The generator and turbine housing in each unit had access doors, enabling each to be entered for maintenance.

Basement

The basement proper extends beneath the generating units and back under the control room section of the building. The basement is 8'-0" high. A lower room, reached from a stairway in the center of the basement, is currently used for document and small parts storage. Another room originally held the oil sump tanks.

---

[83] "Largest Western Hydro Plant Starts Up," *Electrical World*, October 20, 1923, 830.

Control Building – First Floor
The narrow rear portion of the generating building has two stories. On original construction the first floor held the shop room, air compressors, and the 220V station light and power bus on its western end. The kitchen, locker room, washroom, and an office occupied the central part of the floor (Views CA-167-H-28 through CA-167-H-30). At the eastern end of the building were the control room, telephone room, and assistant superintendent's office. The control room was located between Units 3 and 4, at the center line of the building after its extension in 1980 (see CA-167-H-47). Doors between the control building and the generator floor are located in a line with each generating unit (View CA-167-H-36).

Control Building – Second Floor
The second floor of the control building held three sets of disconnecting and oil switches, separated by a battery room and rheostat room. A long corridor, partially open, ran along the balustrade wall separating the control building from the generating room (see CA-167-H-48).

Transformer Platform
Powerhouse 3 was furnished with seven 200kV transformers on initial construction in 1923, two for each initial unit plus a spare. The transformers were spaced 20 feet at their centerpoints, aligned with the axes of the generating units. Between the platform and the building are the humidifier air intakes. A parapet wall runs along the edge of the platform, with lampposts rising from it at intervals. Rail tracks run between parapet wall and transformers to enable equipment to be moved. At the western end of the platform is located a 750kVA substation (for station light and power).

Mechanicals and Operation
General
Hydroelectric plants such as Big Creek Powerhouse 3 convert the mechanical force of falling water into electrical energy through electromagnetic induction. Water flows through long tubes known as penstocks and is then directed through a nozzle onto the buckets of the turbines, causing them to rotate. The turbines are directly connected to the generator shaft, causing it to turn. A governor is attached to each turbine, allowing the operator to control the speed of the wheel by reducing or increasing water flow against the buckets.

The generator consists of two magnetized copper coils, one rotating (rotor) and the other stationary (stator). To generate power, the rotor coils must be energized by the input of direct current (DC) from an exciter (a separate motor or generator), which produces a magnetic field. The rotation of the magnetized rotor field against the stator windings produces electromagnetic flux and induces alternating current (AC) in the stator's output terminals.

Current from the generators is sent through step-up transformers, which increase the voltage to a level desirable for transmission, and then into transmission lines leaving the plant. Between the generator and transformer, low-tension bus rooms allow electric current from the generators to be sent to different banks of transformers. Between transformers and transmission lines high-tension bus rooms allow current to be switched between different transformer banks and transmission lines. Having parallel sets of generating, bussing, transforming, and transmission equipment allows generation to continue even when individual elements of the system must be taken offline for maintenance or due to mechanical problems.

Hydraulic equipment in the plant was supplied by Wellman-Seaver-Morgan (Units 1, 2, and 3) and Pelton Water Wheel (house generator). Electrical equipment was from Westinghouse. Powerhouse 3 was the world's second plant to transmit at 220kV, a new record set when the Big Creek system converted to that voltage in May 1923.[84]

Hydraulic

Penstocks

Water for Powerhouse 3 was impounded in front of Powerhouse 8 behind Dam No. 6, constructed in 1921-1922. Water enters Tunnel 3, 21' in cross section, and travels to a point above the powerhouse. Near the end of the tunnel is a horizontal surge chamber which functions to absorb the pressure of the water column in the event that the powerhouse suddenly shuts down. The water exits the tunnel and enters two spherical manifolds that divide into four and two penstock outlets respectively.[85] The penstocks enter the plant at the basement level (CA-167-H-9).

Turbines

The turbines in Powerhouse 3 are vertical-shaft, single runner Francis-type reaction turbines, a different design than those in Powerhouses 1, 2, and 2A but similar to those in Powerhouse 8. A reaction turbine is one in which the water changes pressure inside the turbine. The inner vanes of the turbine are spirally curved and diminish in diameter. Following the law of conservation of angular momentum, the water pressure increases as the diameter of spin diminishes. This makes the transfer of energy from the water to the vanes of the turbine more efficient. Due to their suitability for use with low heads, reaction turbines are today the most common type of turbine for hydroelectric power production.

Francis turbines are reaction turbines that combine radial and axial flow. In other words, water spirals not only toward the center of the turbine (radially) but also downward (axially). "Vertical shaft" refers to the fact that the central bearing shaft of the unit is set vertically, so that the turbine and generator rotate in the horizontal plane. A "single runner" unit is one that uses a single water wheel to turn the generator (many horizontal units use two wheels, one on each side of the generator). In Powerhouse 3, the main generators are in effect stacked on top of their turbines.

The three initial turbines in Powerhouse 3 were purchased from the Wellman-Seaver-Morgan Company of Cleveland, Ohio. They were identical 35,000hp single-runner, downward discharge, vertical Francis type turbines operating under a head of 827 feet. Unlike previous Big Creek plants, Powerhouse 3 was designed to generate both 50 cycle power at 428 rpm, or 60 cycle power at 514 rpm, foreshadowing the 1947 conversion of the entire Southern California Edison system to 60-cycle power.

[84] "Transmission at 220,000 Volts," 1107.
[85] Redinger, *Story of Big Creek*, 93, 95.

The turbines, along with the accompanying inlet pipes, draft tube linings, relief valves, stilling boxes, and bearing oil pumps, were purchased on Wellman-Seaver-Morgan Contract 22649.[86]

Governors

Turbine governors control the speed of the turbines by regulating water flow. They control the needle valves at the end of the intake nozzles, allowing variation of the flow of water against the turbine buckets. Units 1-3 at Powerhouse 3 each used 60,000 foot-pound Woodward Type A7 governors, serial numbers 4995, 4996, and 4997. Purchased from Wellman-Seaver-Morgan, the governors came complete with hand control, load limiting devices, gate indicators, a synchronizing attachment, and a tachometer.[87] The governors were operated by oil pressure, with oil stored in pressure tanks 7'-9" high and 42" in diameter.[88]

House Turbines and Governors

Station light and power was supplied by smaller turbines and accompanying generators. Powerhouse 3 was supplied with two 600hp Pelton horizontal impulse wheels running at 750 rpm under an 800' head. The wheels were purchased, along with the needle nozzles, connections, and two Pelton oil pressure governors with a self-contained oil tank, from Pelton Water Wheel Company of San Francisco under Contract 23326. The steel tailrace linings for the house wheels were purchased from Union Tank and Pipe Company.[89]

Electric

Generators

Unit 1, 2, and 3 generators were supplied by Westinghouse and rated for 28,000kVA. They were designed to generate either 50 cycle power at 11kV, or 60 cycle power at 12.5kV. The three initial units bear Westinghouse serial numbers 4197295, 4197296, and 4198297.[90] Together, however, the initial three units made up the largest hydroelectric plant in the western United States at the time of their construction.[91] See CA-167-H-17, CA-167-H-20, CA-167-H-22, CA-167-H-23, for views of the generators.

As noted above, the exciters energize the magnetic field in the generator rotor, which as it rotates induces electric current in the stator. The exciters in Units 1-3 were directly connected to the main generator shaft, and energized the generator windings with 270kW of DC power at 250V and 1080A. These exciters were Westinghouse style 81B771. In addition, each generator had a separate pump unit for circulating oil to the bearings, each consisting of two Brown and Sharpe No. 4 pumps and one Westinghouse ½ hp motor.

---

[86] Kelley, *Valuation*, 108-109; "Work Progressing Rapidly on Big Creek No. Three," 341.
[87] Kelley, *Valuation*, 111.
[88] Kelley, *Valuation*, 112.
[89] Kelley, *Valuation*, 110-112.
[90] Kelley, *Valuation*, 120.
[91] "Big Creek No. 3 is Put on Power Company's Lines," *Journal of Electricity*, October 15, 1923, 311; "Largest Western Hydro Plant Starts Up," *Electrical World*, October 20, 1923, *830*.

The use of individual oiling systems for each unit was innovative; previous plants had used a central system that required substantially more piping and equipment.[92]

The three generators for station light and power (house generators) were also purchased from Westinghouse and generated 375kVA of 50-cycle power at 220V and 985A. They also had direct connected exciters generating 5kW at 125V and 40A.[93]

Low-Tension Switches
The three low-tension oil switches for generators 2 and 3 were Westinghouse type CO2 three-tank, solenoid operated, rated for 15kV at 2000A. The Unit 1 switch, plus a spare, had the same rating but was Westinghouse type CO1.[94]

Control and Maintenance
Control Room
The main switchboard consisted of a Westinghouse Type D3 three-section benchboard control desk in natural black slate. To the rear of the desk control were an additional three panel sections and two panels to fill in the sides of the desk. The auxiliary control board consisted of seven sections of natural black slate, also supplied by Westinghouse.[95]

Crane
The traveling crane serving the generating floor was a 125-ton capacity Niles standard 4 motor, single trolley crane with a 15-ton capacity auxiliary hoist.[96]

Alterations and Additions
Powerhouse 3, like the other powerhouses in the Big Creek system, is a working industrial facility and has been in continuous operation since its construction in 1923. As such, it has been subject to regular maintenance, overhaul, and sometimes replacement of equipment. This section details only major modifications to the plant. The narrative relies on information collected from Big Creek No. 3 *Annual Reports* by Don Dukleth of Southern California Edison Northern Hydro Division in September 2009.

After the plant was put online in 1923, the turbines experienced mechanical problems that reduced efficiency. As Kelley noted:

> subsequent to placing Power House No. 3 in operation, certain inefficiencies and mechanical failures occurred in the main turbines. A refund of $15,000.00 was arranged, due to the inability of the turbines to meet the efficiencies guaranteed by the Wellman-Seaver-Morgan Company in Contract No. 22649…

[92] "Largest Western Hydro Plant Starts Up," 830; "Work Progressing Rapidly," 341.
[93] Kelley, *Valuation*, 121.
[94] Kelley, *Valuation*, 122.
[95] Kelley, *Valuation*, 125.
[96] Kelley, *Valuation*, 50.

> The cost of correcting mechanical failures was held as a claim against the Wellman-Seaver-Morgan Company in the amount of $13,336.47... Final compromise resulted in a payment of $8,500.00 by the supplier, leaving a balance of $4,836.47 to be sustained by the Southern California Edison Company.[97]

As noted in the historical narrative above, a penstock accident killed a Big Creek No. 3 employee on March 14, 1924. The rushing water broke windows, broke away part of the Unit 3 air duct, soaked the Unit 2 house generator set, and tore a hole in the roof, requiring repairs to these items.[98]

The late 1930s saw upgrades to the 220kV equipment at the plant. In 1935, the 220kV busses were replaced, and the 220kV switches were upgraded in 1937. In 1941 a third 220kV bus was added to the plant.

In 1946, a machine shop was built on the south (penstock) side of the powerhouse. The architectural design of the building is shown in CA-167-H-53. Views CA-167-H-31 through CA-167-H-35 also show the machine shop. The following year installation of the fourth generating unit was begun, which required some new concrete work in the generator pit and a new penstock line in addition to the generating equipment. Unit 4 went online in 1948. About the same time the No. 2 transformer bank was replaced, along with all of the generator field poles. New governors for units 1, 2, and 3 were also added at this time.[99]

In 1950, a recording meter and housing were installed on Unit 4, and the No. 2 governor was replaced. Unit 3 was upgraded in 1952. In 1955, a field breaker was installed in the pilot exciter circuits of units 1, 2, and 3, power and control cables were replaced between powerhouse and switchyard, and new auxiliary switchboard equipment was installed. More alterations to the control room came in 1959, when the room was remodeled and the ceiling lights upgraded, and in 1962, when the gauge boards and meters for Units 1, 2, and 3 were upgraded.[100]

The power plant and equipment were repainted in 1960. In 1968 the Unit 3 oil filled neutral transformer was replaced with a new model and the 12kV disconnects were removed and replaced. Between 1978 and 1980 the plant was expanded to its current dimensions, as envisioned in the original 1923 plants. An addition to the eastern end of the building made room for two additional generating units and penstock entries. Unit 5 went on line in 1980.[101] Although the building has space for a sixth generating unit, it has not yet been built.

---

[97] Kelley, *Unit Cost Development*, 223.
[98] W.R. Battey, George C. Heckman, and J.M. Gaylord, letter to Mr. B.F. Pearson regarding the Big Creek Number 3 penstock accident, March 19, 1924, in Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse #3, Big Creek, CA.
[99] Don Dukleth, "Changes to Powerhouse 3 after 1929," memorandum supplied to consultants based on Southern California Edison Northern Hydro Division Annual Reports, 2009.
[100] Dukleth, "Changes to Powerhouse 3."
[101] Southern California Edison, "Memorandum."

CONTEXT AND SIGNIFICANCE

Preservation

Environmental Setting
The landscape around Powerhouse 3 remains mostly undeveloped and has changed little since its construction in 1923. The area immediately around the plant, however, has been modified from its historic configuration by the addition of additional penstocks and the adjacent machine shop (1946).

Structural/Façade/Exterior
The exterior of Powerhouse 3 was expanded between 1978 and 1980. The expansion, however, followed the 1923 expansion plans and is aesthetically consistent with the original design. The original portion of the building is in good condition and has not been modified structurally or aesthetically. Windows remain in their original metal sash. The appearance of the transformer platform has changed, however, since the original cylindrical tank-type transformers have been modernized. On the south or penstock side of the plant, the original façade is largely obscured by the machine shop.

Interior
The interior of Powerhouse 3 exhibits good integrity. The generators remain in their original housing and the layout of machinery has not changed since original installation, although new governor cabinets have been installed adjacent to each unit. Sometime after 1946, the south wall of the main generator floor was cut to provide an entrance into the machine shop. The control room has also been modernized.

The excellent state of preservation, continuity of use, and integrity of setting appear to present sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the structure.

Significance

Big Creek Powerhouse 3 is a NRHP-eligible structure of statewide significance, part of a district of national significance. As the discussion above suggests, the powerhouse retains substantial structural and functional integrity.

At the time of its construction, Big Creek 3 was the largest hydroelectric generating plant in the western United States. Dubbed "The Electrical Wonder of the West" by the electrical press, the plant was expanded to a total of five generating units by 1980. It was the second hydroelectric plant in the world to use 220kV in commercial transmission. The outdoor switching yard at Big Creek No. 3 marks the transition from the early phase of powerhouse design, in which transformers and switching took place within the generating buildings, to the later use of outdoor transformers and switchyards.

The Big Creek system is also significant in the history of the Los Angeles region. Conceived as a means of powering both residential development and electric railways, power from Southern California Edison's Big Creek plants was instrumental in the rise of suburban development in the region. The system is closely associated with railroad, energy, and development magnate Henry Huntington; with Edison executives and power pioneers A.C.

Balch, William Kerckhoff, and George C. Ward; visionary California hydroelectric engineer John Eastwood; and longtime Big Creek manager David Redinger.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Research Sites

Archival research for this report was conducted in the following locations:

- Water Resources Library, University of California, Berkeley, California
- Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, California
- Engineering Library, University of California, Berkeley, California
- University of California Northern Regional Library Facility, Richmond Field Station, Richmond, California
- Philadelphia Free Library, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Southern California Edison Collection, Huntington Library, San Marino, California
- Plant Accounting Department, Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, California
- Northern Hydro Division Headquarters, Southern California Edison Company, Big Creek, California
- Big Creek Powerhouse 1, Big Creek, California
- Big Creek Powerhouse 2/2A, Big Creek, California
- Big Creek Powerhouse 3, Big Creek, California
- Big Creek Powerhouse 8, Big Creek, California

Primary Sources

"The 150,000-Volt Big Creek Development – I." *Electrical World*, January 3, 1914, 33-38.

"The 150,000-Volt Big Creek Development – II." *Electrical World*, January 10, 1914, 85-88.

Bangsbury, O.C., "Weekly Letter Report, B.C. 3, April 16, 1927." In Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 3.

Barre, H.A. "Transmission at 220,000 Volts." *Electrical World,* March 15, 1924, 515-518.

Battey, W.R., George C. Heckman, and J.M. Gaylord. Letter to Mr. B.F. Pearson regarding the Big Creek Number 3 penstock accident, March 19, 1924. In Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse #3, Big Creek, CA.

Big Creek No. 1. *Daily Log*. December 1, 1913. In Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 1.

"Big Creek No. 2 Power House Being Extended 56 ft." *Journal of Electricity* 54 (6): 212.

Big Creek No. 3. *Floor Log Volume 11 (1926-1927).* In Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 3.

Big Creek No. 3. *Floor Log Volume 12 (1927).* In Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 3.

"Big Creek No. 3 is Put on Power Company's Lines." *Journal of Electricity*, October 15, 1923, 311.

"Big Creek No. 8 Hydro-Electric Unit Completed." *Journal of Electricity and Western Industry*, August 11, 1921, 160.

"Big Creek-San Joaquin Hydro-Electric Project of the Southern California Edison Company." *Western Construction News*, July 10, 1927, 28-36.

"Big Creek Work Nears Completion." *Fresno Morning Republican*, December 2, 1913.

"Break in Big Creek Penstock Results in Two Deaths." *Journal of Electricity*, January 15, 1923, 71.

Dukleth, Don. "Changes to Powerhouse 3 after 1929." Memorandum supplied to consultants, based on Southern California Edison Northern Hydro Division Annual Reports, 2009.

Eastwood, John S. "Progress Report for 1903-1904 of Right of Way Surveys and Outline Plan for Power Plant No. 1," 1904. In Folder 11, Box 302, Southern California Edison Papers, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

___________. "Comparative Estimate of Cost of Water-Power Transmission Plant vs. Steam Plant, for W.G. Kerckhoff, President, Pacific Light and Power Company," 1905, Document No. 12871. In History and Information File, Northern Hydro Division Headquarters Library, Big Creek, California.

Edison Club #21. "Minutes, Regular Meeting, December 3, 1931." In Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 1.

Edison Club #28. "Minutes of regular monthly meeting, held Thursday, October 5th, 1933." In Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 2/2A.

"Fire at Big Creek Causes Damage of $10,000." *Fresno Morning Republican*, October 20, 1913.

Fourteenth Census of the United States, Cascada Precinct, Fresno County, California, 1920. On file, University of California at Berkeley.

"Fourth Plant on Big Creek Started." *Electrical World*, April 28, 1923, 996-997.

Hilbert, P.H. to R.B. Lawton. "Big Creek No. 8 Operating Shift Schedule." Memorandum dated February 19, 1926. In File 29-940.1, Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 8.

Jessup, Walter. "A High-head Hydroelectric Power Development in the Sierra Nevada Mountains, California." *The Wisconsin Engineer* 18 (1914): 193-211.

Kelley, Arthur R. *Valuation of Electric Properties, Southern California Edison Big Creek No. 3 Development, December 31, 1924.* Federal Project 67 Appendices, Plant Accounting Department, Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA.

__________. *Unit Cost Development and Price Book Accompanying Valuation of Electric Properties, Southern California Edison Big Creek No. 3 Development, December 31, 1924.* Federal Project 67 Appendices, Plant Accounting Department, Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA.

__________. *Price Book Accompanying Valuation of Electric Properties, Southern California Edison Big Creek No. 3 Development, December 31, 1924.* Federal Project 67 Appendices, Plant Accounting Department, Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA.

"Largest Western Hydro Plant Starts Up." *Electrical World*, October 20, 1923, 830.

Lawton, R.B. to D.D. Morgan. "Operating Force – Big Creek." Undated memorandum, probably 1922. In File 29-939, Archive Room, Big Creek Powerhouse 8, Big Creek, CA.

"Merger of California Hydroelectric Systems." *Electrical World*, December 9, 1916, 1134-1137.

Redinger, David H. "Progress on the Big Creek Hydro-Electric Project, Part I." *Compressed Air Magazine,* December 1923, 720-724.

__________. "Progress on the Big Creek Hydro-Electric Project, Part II." *Compressed Air Magazine,* January 1924, 747-750.

__________. "Progress on the Big Creek Hydro-Electric Project, Part III." *Compressed Air Magazine,* March 1924, 803-808.

__________. "Progress on the Big Creek Hydro-Electric Project, Part IV." *Compressed Air Magazine,* April 1924, 837-842.

__________. "Progress on the Big Creek Hydro-Electric Project, Part V." *Compressed Air Magazine,* September 1924, 989-992.

"Second Unit Installed at Big Creek Plant No. 8." *Electrical West*, July 1, 1929, 38.

Shaw, W. D. "Hydroelectric Construction and Progress to Meet Growing Power Demand." *Journal of Electricity,* June 15, 1925, 544-546.

Smith, R.E. "Big Creek Plant Adds 30,000 Hp. to Western Power Supply." *Journal of Electricity and Western Industry,* September 1, 1921, 188.

Sohier, W. *The Big Creek Project, A History, December 27, 1917*. Typescript. In Folder 7, Box 302, Southern California Edison Papers, Huntington Library, San Marino, California.

Southern California Edison. *1927 Annual Report, Big Creek Division.* In History and Information File, Northern Hydro Division Headquarters, Big Creek, California.

__________. *1928 Annual Report, Big Creek Division.* In History and Information File, Northern Hydro Division Headquarters, Big Creek, California.

__________. *1929 Annual Report, Big Creek Division.* In History and Information File, Northern Hydro Division Headquarters, Big Creek, California.

__________. "Memorandum, Hydro Generation, Northern Division, Generator Winding Data Revised to May 13, 1985." On file, Southern California Edison Northern Hydro Division headquarters, Big Creek, CA.

"Southern California Edison's Advance." *Electrical West,* April 21, 1928, 829.

"Southern California Edison Company to Start 150,000-Kw. Station." *Electrical World,* September 24, 1921, 636.

Stone and Webster Construction Company. "Progress of the Big Creek Initial Development: Report to Pacific Light and Power Corporation, January 1, 1913." In Water Resources Library, University of California, Berkeley.

_________. "Big Creek Initial Development 1914." In Water Resources Library, University of California, Berkeley.

Tenney, George C. "More than a Million Horsepower." *Journal of Electricity and Western Industry,* April 1, 1923, 243-253.

"Transmission at 220,000 Volts a Fact." *Electrical World,* May 12, 1923, 1107.

"Work Progressing Rapidly on Big Creek No. Three." *Journal of Electricity and Western Industry*, May 1, 1923, 341.

Secondary Sources

Bradley, Betsy Hunter. *The Works: The Industrial Architecture of the United States.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Downing, P.M., O.B. Caldwell, E.R. Davis, W.G.B. Euler, and C.C. MacCalla. "Report of the Sub-committee on Water Development on the Pacific Coast." In National Electric Light Association *Papers Reports and Discussions, Hydro-Electric and Transmission Sections Technical Sessions, National Electric Light Association Thirty-Eight Convention,* 510-601. San Francisco: National Electric Light Association, 1915.

Federal Power Commission. *Directory of Electric Generating Plants.* Washington, D.C.: Federal Power Commission, 1941.

Hay, Duncan. *Hydroelectric Development in the United States, 1880-1940.* Washington, D.C.: Edison Electric Institute, 1991.

Hughes, Thomas P. *Networks of Power: Electrification in Western Society, 1880-1930.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Kirker, Harold. *California's Architectural Frontier: Style and Tradition in the 19th Century.* San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1960.

Redinger, David H. *The Story of Big Creek.* Los Angeles: Angelus Press, 1949.

Shoup, Laurence H. *"The Hardest Working Water in the World": A History and Significance Evaluation of the Big Creek Hydroelectric System.* Report prepared for Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA, 1987.

_________. *Life at Big Creek Town 1929-1947: Historic Context Statement and National Register of Historic Places Significance Evaluation.* Southern California Edison Company, Rosemead, CA, 1997.

Whitney, Charles A. "John Eastwood: Unsung Genius of the Drawing Board." *Montana: The Magazine of Western History*, Summer 1969.

U.S. Department of Energy. *Inventory of Power Plants in the United States, 1981 Annual.* Washington. D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy, 1982.

Likely Sources Not Yet Investigated
The consultants are not aware of likely sources that have not yet been investigated.

APPENDIX A

Historical photographs of Big Creek Powerhouse 3 are held in the Southern California Edison collection at the Huntington Library, San Marino, California. The following photographs in the collection illustrate the plant between the mid-1920s and the 1950s.

- 13833
- 12663
- 13827
- 12150
- 12158
- 12161
- 15655
- 12672
- 18860
- 53953